THE MANAGERS *Pro* and *Con*:

OR, AN

ACCOUNT

Of what is said at

Child's and *Tom*'s Coffee-Houses

For and Against

Dr. *SACHEVERELL.*

Per Graijum populos, media[illegible] Elidis urbem
Ibat ovans, divumque sibi poscebat honores.

The Fifth Edition.

LONDON:
Printed, and are to be Sold by *A. Baldwin* in *Warwick-Lane.* 1710.
Price Six Pence.

AC911.1710.S7

THE MANAGERS *PRO* and *CON.*

WHEN I saw Doctor *Sacheverell*, that *Triumphant Criminal*, pass by my Door in a Flaming and Open Chariot, now and then stopping, and then marching slowly in *State* to *Westminster-hall*, Impeach'd by the Commons of *Great Britain*, for a *Wicked, Malicious and Seditious Intention to undermine and subvert Her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession as by Law established; to defame Her Majesty's Administration; to asperse the Memory of his late Majesty; to traduce and condemn the late Happy Revolution; to contradict and Arraign the Resolutions of both Houses of Parliament; to excite Jealousies and Divisions amongst Her Majesty's Subjects; and to incite 'em to Sedition and Rebellion.* Which in my humble Opinion, amounts to somewhat more than *High Crimes and Misdemeanors.* I cou'd not but think it an unparalell'd Presumption in the Prisoner, to go so Rebelliously attended, when, as a Publick Enemy to his Church and Country, he ought to have been drawn upon a Sledge.

The Doctor appear'd to me to be Gay and Insolent, which made me Serious: The Occasion and Subject was the same, but by us differently consider'd. I, who can never forget our *Deliverer*; He, who will never forgive Him: I, who am so pleased and easy under Her Majesty's Administration; He, who is so restless and discontented:

I, who am so Sollicitous to confirm the *Hanover* Succession; He, who is so active to defeat it. Yet I cou'd not but be of Opinion with him, that He was going to the *Hall* to make good upon the *Commons* the *Accusation of Treason and Rebellion*, upon which he had lately *Arraign'd* 'em in St. *Paul's Church*. *To Him, and to Me*, He, and his Council, seem'd to be the Managers for the Pretender; and the *Commons Managers*, seem'd only to be of Council for the *Queen and the Nation*: He and I thought, that whilst they pretended to Prosecute him, they only *pleaded their own Cause*; and if he had been *acquitted* of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, they must have been *convicted* of Rebellion and Perjury. This we both thought was the True State of the Case, which so differently affected us.

The Lords our Judges have agreed, That the Commons have made good the several Articles of Impeachment, and notwithstanding the Doctor solemnly *forswore* it, have found him guilty of the *Criminal Intention*; but yet such is their Humanity, such their undeserv'd Mercy, that if compar'd with the unexampled Cruelties, and unprecedented Punishments inflicted formerly by *Laud*, and the *High-Church-Party* in the *Star-Chamber*, the World must own, that their Chastisements are next to Impunity; the Crime only censur'd, the Criminal dismiss'd; and must confess too, that there is something more than *Cant*, in that Divine and *Royal* Word, *Moderation*.

Since the Doctor has publish'd his colourable Defence, by way of *Seditious Appeal* to the People, and 'tis impossible so soon to Print off the excellent Arguments of the Managers for the Commons, I wish some better Pen, who had heard 'em, wou'd have undertaken to have wiped out the Impression, that the Doctor's evasive and prevaricating Speech has made upon some People, whose Passions of every kind are much easier moved, than their Judgments rightly inform'd; which is my Excuse for this Paper.

ARTICLE I.

THE Doctor in his Speech is pleased to affirm, that the *Managers of the Commons* have supported their Charge

Charge by *Intendments, unneceſſary Implications, and ſtrain'd Conſtructions; by piecing broken Sentences, conjoining diſtant and independent Paſſages, in order to make him ſpeak what he never thought of.* *Speech, p. 5.*

The *Managers* methinks were very patient to hear this Language, and very indulgent to acquieſce in his Printing it, before their Arguments were publiſhed, that the World might judge whether they were the *artful Knaves*, which, in my Opinion, the Doctor has here *repreſented* 'em, by applying to them the True Character of the *King's Council in a former Reign:* But I hope, that even *the Managers at* Tom's *Coffee-houſe* are able to vindicate the *Managers* of the Commons from this Aſperſion, till they have an Opportunity to do it much better themſelves. The *Managers* at *Tom*'s to ſupport the firſt Article, read Forty four *continued* Lines of the Sermon, out of which intirely they maintain their Charge. And is this *to piece broken Sentences, and to conjoin diſtant and independent Paſſages?* The *Managers* begin with the 11th Page. *The grand Security of our Government, and the very Pillar upon which it ſtands, is founded upon the ſteady Belief of the Subjects Obligation to an abſolute and unconditional Obedience to the ſupream Power, in all Things Lawful; and the utter Illegality of Reſiſtance upon any pretence whatſoever.* Here the Managers go on *verbatim*, till they come to theſe Words, *Our Adverſaries think they have us ſure and unanſwerable on this Point, when they urge the Revolution of this Day in their Defence. But certainly they are the greateſt Enemies of that, and his late Majeſty, and the moſt ungrateful for the Deliverance, who endeavour to caſt ſuch black and odious Colours upon both: How often muſt they be told, that the King himſelf ſolemnly diſclaim'd the leaſt Imputation of Reſiſtance, and the Parliament declared, that they ſet the Crown on his Head, upon no other Title but that of the Vacancy of the Throne.* *Sermon at St. Paul's, 2 Edit. p. 11, 12.*

Upon this the *Managers* at *Tom*'s charge you with *ſuggeſting and maintaining, That the neceſſary Means uſed to bring about the late Happy Revolution, were odious and unjuſtifiable.* The Managers affirm and prove, that there was Reſiſtance at the Revolution, and that the Reſiſtance then made, was the neceſſary means to bring about the Revolution,

Revolution. You say in your Sermon, and confirm it in your Answer and Speech, That *all Resistance upon any Pretence whatsoever, is utterly Illegal.* Do the *Managers* then make an unnecessary *Implication*; when they infer, that if Resistance be *utterly illegal*, that it is odious and unjustifiable? When you say that it is not justifiable *in any case whatsoever*, is it a *strained Construction* to make you say that it is unjustifiable in the Case of the Revolution? And when you say that it is odious and unjustifiable, is it not a fair Collection, to say that you *have cast odious and black Colours upon it.*

The Managers at *Child*'s answer this, and say, that tho' Resistance should have been made, and tho' it were justifiable, yet the *Resistance was not the necessary* Means, nor did it bring about the *Revolution*, but that the *Abdication was the Cause of the Revolution*, and the *Resistance* was only the *Causa sine qua non.*

This Learned Distinction has struck deep into the Noddles of those who are lately come from the *University*, and many, who have lived too long in it. But I must ask 'em, Whether the *Resistance* was the Cause of the *Abdication*, or the *Abdication* was the Cause of the *Resistance?* If they think fit to allow that the Resistance was the Cause of the *Abdication*, then the Resistance must be the *causa efficiens*, and the necessary Means; and the Abdication only the *causa sine qua non.* Nor was the *Abdication*, (which was but one Instance of the late King's Male-administration among many others enumerated in the *Act of Rights*, *Primo Gul. & Mar.*) the sole Cause of the Vacancy of the Throne.

Here I must take notice of a *General Plea* that some of your *Managers* have put in for you, which goes to the whole, that *Whereas your Sermons being only a Bundle of inconsistent Nonsense, they know no Law in Being, by which a Fool is punishable; and that the Consequences wou'd extend to too many, if a President shou'd be made, to correct any Body for Preaching and Speaking foolishly.* I know that this pinches close a Person of your Pride and Self-sufficiency, to have such an Aspersion cast upon your Parts; and do really believe that you wou'd rather plead Guilty, than own your self to be an *Insignificant*, and to oblige you I'll take upon me the *Defence* of your *Understanding*, and shew that you had a *Meaning*, and a *malicious* one, which, (as

it

it happens commonly to Men of your *Capacity)* is always *uppermoſt*, for if you were ſo weak as to *mean nothing* at all, you were certainly a very *inſignificant Tool of the Party*.

The firſt Article againſt your Underſtanding is grounded upon this *Poſition* of yours, *That an abſolute and unconditional Obedience is due to the ſupream Power, in all things Lawful; and that Reſiſtance is utterly illegal upon any Pretence whatſoever.* Here, they ſay, you are perfectly *Abſurd*, and *contradictory* to your ſelf, by tacking a *Condition* to your *unconditional* Obedience, and thereby you aſſert nothing, and are very *clear* of any *Suſpicion* of a *Meaning* in this place. But in this Point, Doctor, I own you are extreamly wrong'd, for I think that you write as good Senſe upon the Subject as moſt of the *Fathers* either *living* or *dead*, and you ſeem to think ſo too; and impatient of this Calumny, you point out your Finger in the Margin of your Collections, to a certain Biſhop, as if you deſired him, in his own and your Juſtification to ſay, whether the Diſtinction of *Active Obedience* in all things *lawful*, and *Paſſive Obedience* in all things *poſſible*, won't make your Doctrine Orthodox, and your Senſe unqueſtionable.

But your *Managers at Child's*, who have a better Opinion of your *Underſtanding*, ſay, that your Art was Nice, and your Caution Remarkable, to leave the *Supream Power indefinite*, and at large, to fix it where you pleaſe upon Occaſion; and that, if by any other Paſſages of your Sermon, it ſhou'd be demonſtrated, that by the *Supream Power* you mean the Prince, yet ſtill you are at Liberty to explain that *unconditional Obedience*, as due to his *executive* Power. That you laid down the Doctrine of *Non-Reſiſtance* only as a *general Rule*, to which you allowed *Exceptions*, and that undoubtedly *Non-Reſiſtance* was a *good* and *wholeſome* Doctrine, and proper to be preach'd with a *Mental Reſervation:* That *Neceſſity* made *Reſiſtance* Lawful. And they ſay, that your Council inſiſted much upon this as your beſt Defence. But your *Managers* differ amongſt themſelves in this Point, and thoſe who aſperſe your Underſtanding, ſay, that you were ſtark Mad to depart from the Defence of your Council; and to avow in your Speech, that you preach'd that *Doctrine* in the full Latitude that the *Fathers Dead* and *Living* taught it, becauſe thoſe Fathers, who are the Principal Teachers of *uncon-*

conditional Obedience, (as Bishop *Sanderson*) do most undeniably in express Words exclude *all Exceptions* to their *general Rule*, and 'tis evident that they lodge the *Supream Power* in the Prince, that they make no Distinction of the *executive Power*. This *Justification*, they say, untwists all that your Council said in your Defence, and from hence it follows, that the *Case* of the *Revolution* cou'd not be, even *Mentally* excepted out of your *general Rule*, and I hope that I shall satisfy most People, that your Design was expresly to *condemn* it.

The Doctor says, Page 11. *That our Adversaries think they effectually stop our Mouths, and have us sure and unanswerable on this Point, when they urge the Revolution of this Day in their Defence; but certainly they are the greatest Enemies of that, and his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the Deliverance, who endeavour to cast such black and odious Colours upon both. How often must they be told, that the King himself solemnly disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance in his Declaration, and that the Parliament declared, that they set the Crown on his Head, upon no other Title but that of the Vacancy of the Throne*, &c. And then a little further he says, *Thus do they endeavour to draw Comparisons, and to justify the Horrid Actions and Principles of Forty One.*

The Doctor having laid down the general Rule of Non-Resistance, now undertakes to defend the Generality of it, and being aware that the late Revolution wou'd be objected against it, and lest his *Adversaries* (*viz.* the Friends to the *Revolution*) shou'd offer the Resistance of that Day, as an Exception to his general Rule, he answers 'em before hand, that there was no Resistance at that time, that the King himself has denied the least Resistance, and that they who endeavour to prove there was any Resistance, cast odious and black Colours upon his Majesty, and the Deliverance.

To what purpose was the Case of the Revolution mentioned just after the Doctor's general Rule of the Illegality of Resistance? It must be, either to except it out, or condemn it by that general Rule. If then he excepts it out of the Rule, it is because there was no Resistance made; But if it happens that there was Resistance at the Revolution, the Doctor has cast *odious* and *black Colours* upon both the *Deliverer* and *Deliverance*. And to *blacken*

'em

'em yet more, he says, 'that *thus* (i. e. by maintaining that Resistance) *they* (i.e. *his Adversaries* who defend the Revolution) *justify the Actions and Principles of Forty One* by a Comparison drawn between 'em. By which it's plain that the Doctor makes the Revolution as scandalous as the Transactions about *Forty One*, if founded on Resistance.

The Doctor persists to the last in his Speech, *p.* 7. That there was no Resistance made at the Revolution; What will not this Man dare to affirm or deny? Did not the Bishop of *London* himself re-assume the Sword? And had he not the Honour to have the Princess *ANNE* under his Guard? Did he not display his Colours with that remarkable *Motto*, that succinctly comprehended the reason of the general Resistance, *viz. quia nolumus mutare leges Angliæ?* Did not Archbishop *Sancroft* take up Offensive and Defensive Arms, when he forc'd the *Tower* from the King's Governor? But tell me, Doctor, how cou'd you affirm to the Queen's Face, that there was no Resistance? When you knew that Her Majesty her self was in Arms, and acted so great a part in the *Glorious Revolution*, and that many Hundreds of your Audience had been in *Arms*. How many Lords have since boasted of the Resistance they then made, notwithstanding you were capable of asserting the contrary to their Faces?

I am not surprized to see the Prince of *Orange*'s Declaration wrested by the Doctor, who is as free with the Scriptures; the Prince never disclaim'd Resistance, but the Title of Conquest: But *Sacheverell* either understands nothing, or is resolved to pervert every thing.

It appears by the Letter left by King *James*, That he himself apprehended that he was resisted, when he complains of an *Order sent him at Midnight, to remove next Morning from his Palace, and that the Prince of* Orange's *Guards had taken Possession of the Posts about* Whitehall, without his being *advertis'd* of it; afterwards he says, *He was born free, and desires to continue so*; therefore he *thinks it not convenient to expose himself to be secured, and not to be at Liberty.* 'Tis plain by this Letter, that the King apprehended, that when he was *ordered* to go to *Ham*, that he was made a Prisoner, or at least that he was likely to be made one soon; and to imprison the King, is as high Resistance as can be made. Therefore as many

Vide State Tracts, *Vol.* I.

Gentlemen as believe, there was actual Force, and Resistance made at the Revolution, must say that *Sacheverell* has *cast odious and black Colours* (which I hope won't stick) upon the Revolution; and that he is the *greatest Enemy of that, and his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the Deliverance.*

The Doctor defends the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, as taught by the Sermons or *Homilies* put out in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and says, *That those* Homilies *were* Establish'd *by the Thirty Nine* Articles, *and that those Thirty Nine* Articles *were Confirm'd by the Thirteenth of* Elizabeth, *and that they are now made* Perpetual *and* Fundamental *by the Act of* Union.

The *Managers* against the Doctor attack the very Foundation of the Doctor's Defence, and if the Reader adjudges the Argument to be good, it's a full Answer to all the Speeches that have been made for him; they say, that the Article, which contains the Homilies; and a great many more of the *Nine* and *Thirty Articles*, were not confirm'd by the Thirteenth of *Elizabeth*, nor any other Act of Parliament; and consequently, the Doctrine of Non-Resistance is not deposited in such a Place of Security as in the irrepealable Act of *Union.*

The Statute of the Thirteenth of *Elizabeth* confirms *all the Articles of Religion, which ONLY concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, but neither that Article about the Homilies, nor several other Articles which *ONLY concern Matters* of Discipline, were ever confirm'd by Parliament to this Day. I refer the Reader to the Argument at large annexed to this Paper, which I don't doubt, but will convince him of the Truth of this Assertion.

We must then consider the *Homilies* as so many Sermons wrote by the Clergy in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, when few of them were of tolerable Learning or Abilities: Does it appear that they had our Constitution under Consideration? Does it not appear that they understood nothing of it? The Resistance that was made against *Richard* the Third, was then fresh in their Memory; who, bad as he was, even such an *Anointed* was not to be *touched* by their Rules, if stretch'd to an unlimited Sense. They might have heard of many Precedents of deposing our former *Tyrants*, and easily collected that is was the Practice of the Church,

Church, and Law of *England* in such unfortunate Cases; let us consider their Argument thus.

A *Convocation* of the Clergy confirm a Doctrine, utterly inconsistent with the Constitution of the State, and therefore 'tis an high Presumption in the Laity against the Authority of the Church, to refuse to be bound down by it. Some modern Doctors misapply, and misconstrue those Doctrines, and then it is Irreligion and Atheism to examine or enquire into their Mistakes. May we not be permitted to oppose the Sentiments and Practices of those *Convocations*, against the Opinions and Comments of the Expositors of their Doctrine? It's very probable that the Members of those Convocations best understood their own Meanings, and surely they would never have assisted so freely and largely in resisting the *French* and *Spanish* Tyrants, and defended their oppress'd Subjects, if they had ever thought that Resistance was *de toto genere*, unlawful, and that a Tyrant was upon no Pretence to be resisted. And I think it a fatal Stroke to the Kingdom, if the *Sevennois* were denied Assistance thro' this Modern Principle. Whose Support was both lawful, and of infinite Advantage to the Allies.

To support that unsupportable Sense of the Homilies, the Doctor produces the concurrent Opinions of many Learned Fathers, down from the Reformation to this Day, who have preach'd the same Doctrine, and thinks his Case *extream hard that he should be accused for what others have receiv'd Thanks*; he might very truly have added, and been made Bishops for it, and then he would have explain'd the Reason why they preach'd it, and what he himself expected for having done it.

It is allowed by all sides that the *Manwarins* and *Sibthorps* were the first Authors of King *Charles*'s Misfortunes, by misguiding his *Conscience* in the very same Point, in effect, that you endeavour to deceive the Queen: It was some as wicked as you who perswaded her Father, that the Church of *England* wou'd not, nay, cou'd not, resist; and you think it your *singular Misfortune* that for this fatal Doctrine you have not received Thanks, or Preferment from Her Majesty.

Notwithstanding that some Fathers have strain'd such Homilies as regard this Point, which was always the high way to Preferment, yet they have rejected others; which

is a ſtrong Argument to me, that that Article which contains the Homilies was never confirm'd by Parliament, and that the Clergy thought themſelves at liberty to amend, alter, or reject, wholly, or in part, any Article that did not *concern the Confeſſion of the True Chriſtian Faith, or Doctrine of the Sacraments*; and therefore the Homily about the Idolatry of Pictures and Organs, is now exploded as erroneous, and the Uſe of them now *allowed*; which cou'd not have been done by the Clergy alone, if that Article about the *Homilies* had been confirm'd by the 13*th* of *Elizabeth*, as it is pretended.

The Doctor's *Managers* inſiſt, that their Doctrine of *Non-Reſiſtance* is *warranted* by Law, and to prove this they read a Clauſe in the Militia Act of the 13*th* of *Charles* the II. viz. *That both*, or *either of the Houſes of Parliament, may not lawfully raiſe, or levy* War, *Offenſive or Defenſive, againſt his Majeſty*; and the ſame Parliament in the next Seſſions fram'd a Poſition in the *Corporation Act* in the ſame Senſe, and almoſt in the ſame Words, viz. *That it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatſoever, to take Arms againſt the King*, and obliged People to Swear to this Declaration. The Oath in the *Corporation* Act, and the Clauſe in the *Militia* Act, being convertible Poſitions, both only declaring the Illegality of reſiſting the King, if the Clauſe were made the *Oath*, or the *Oath* turn'd into the *Clauſe*, it wou'd make no difference: Since therefore the *Corporation Oath ſtands* repealed by the 1*ſt* of *W.* and *M.* the Militia *Clauſe* being one and the ſame thing with the *Oath*, is not only virtually, but expreſly repealed too; and thoſe Acts being made upon the Reſtoration, only to condemn the *Antimonarchical* Principles, and to ſettle the Power of the Militia in the King, it wou'd aſtoniſh the Makers, who deſign'd only to preſerve *one part* of the Conſtitution, *viz. The Monarchy*, to ſee that very Act ſtretch'd to the Subverſion of the *whole*.

They who are not ſatisfy'd with this, may obſerve, that by the ſeveral Acts mention'd in the Preamble of the Impeachment, the very Subſtance and Intention (if it had any ſuch Intention) of the *Militia* Act is *damn'd*, and the *Arms* of Reſiſtance avowed to have been *juſtifiable* and *neceſſary*; and to confirm the *Legality* of *Reſiſtance* in ſome Caſes, the Act of *Rights* and *Liberties*, 1*ſt G. & M. Sect.* 9. ſays, That upon ſuch and ſuch Miſdemeanors of the King

and

and Queen, that the Subjects shall thereby be *absolved* from their *Allegiance*, which Act will and ought to protect them against the Statute of Treasons of *E.* III. if they in such Cases do Resist: And this Act will justify, that there is an *indispensible Duty of Resistance* in some Cases, and that they are *Traitors to Posterity*, who refuse to perform the Trust repos'd in 'em by this Act; that to *encourage* them to *Resist*, has *absolved* them from their *Allegiance*; that to *protect* 'em in *Resistance*, has granted 'em an *Indemnity*.

But since some Learned Gentlemen would prove the Law *felo de se*, and make a Clause of one Act, to destroy both Law and Parliament; since some ridicule the *Original Contract*, by importunately desiring to see it, I hope I shall be able here to give a good Account of it, and to shew the Original Right of the *People* to defend themselves against a King becoming a Tyrant.

I suppose no body expects to see an Original Contract in Writing, Time must needs have worn out that, and 'tis likely 'twas only verbal; and we must be satisfy'd with the best Evidence a Matter of that Nature is capable of: If the first Records of Authority mention the *Conditional Tenure* of the Crown, and the Duties impos'd on the King by the People; if our former Kings have confirm'd this in Parliament; if the Opinions of all the Antient Lawyers agree, that the People had an *Original* Right to what was so confirm'd; if the People have ever since enjoy'd and maintain'd that Right, sure there's something more than *Fable* in this *Original Compact*.

In the *Saxon* Parliaments, few new Laws were enacted: but the Custom then was, for some of the most Learned Members to declare upon Oath the Fundamental Laws of the Realm to the King and the People. I find in *Edward* the Confessor's time, twelve Sworn Sages pronounced the Law, thus: *Rex, ad hoc est constitutus; ut Regnum & Ecclesiam ab injuriosis defendat, quod nisi fecerit, nec nomen regis in eo constabit, verum nomen Regis perdit, debet Justicia magis regnare quam voluntas Prava*; and further, *Rex eris dum bene regis, quod nisi feceris, nomen Regis perdis.* Lambard 142. I observ'd here, that first the excellent Duties of the King are enumerated, and the Purposes specify'd for which he was made: That in the beginning there was a Limitation set upon his Power, that

that he ſhould Rule by the Law, and not by wicked Will or Arbitrary Power: That the Original Conditions were expreſſed, for the breach of which he was to be Unking'd. Which ſtrongly makes out an Original Contract.

If it be obſerv'd here, that it is not expreſly ſaid, that the King was conſtituted by the *People*, nor that the *People* are to depoſe him upon failure of his Duty: Yet it muſt be allow'd, that there were Conditions annexed to the Crown, and that it was forfeitable for the Breach of them; and when we find who had a Right to puniſh delinquent Kings, we ſhall diſcover between whom the Original Contract was made.

The Conqueſt has made no alteration in our Fundamental Laws; for even the Conqueror ſubmitted to wear the Crown upon the Conditions that his *Saxon* Predeceſſors had enjoy'd it. After this, the firſt memorable Aſſertion of the People's Right by the Original Contract, was in King *John*'s time, which at laſt ended in a full Recognition of the People's Right to dethrone Tyrannizing Kings. I'll only repeat part of the ſubſtance of a Clauſe in the Act of Parliament, drawn in the form of a Charter, and refer the Examination of it to the whole Clauſe in the Appendix:

Charter of K. John, *dated at* Running Mead. *If the King, or his Juſtices in his Abſence, do not reform Miſcarriages within Forty Days after they are complain'd of, the Five and Twenty Barons, and all the Commonalty of* England *may diſtreſs us by all the ways they can, till it be amended, and the Subjects may Swear to Obey the ſaid Barons, and to diſtreſs us.*

I know of no Objection to be made againſt this Charter, but what may be made againſt the Great Charter; and Hiſtorians ſay, they are the very ſame, which may be the reaſon why this is omitted out of the Statute-Book. The Lawyers of thoſe times concur, that the People inſiſted only upon their Ancient Liberties; the Confeſſor's Laws ſay, the Tyrant ſhall be Unking'd. This Charter declares who ſhall have Power to *Unking* him. The Method only was then ſettled of making uſe of the Coercive Power of the People, which was before their *Original Right.*

Bracton, Lib. 2. *C.* 16. *Fleta, Lib.* 1. *C.* 17. expreſs themſelves, *That the Law is above the King; that the High Court*

Court (of Parliament) *is ſuperior to the King*; *that the King is made by the Law: And therefore if the King be without a Bridle, that is, without Law, they muſt Bridle him.* Theſe Opinions juſtify, that the People had a Right to Bridle King *John*, a moſt unruly Prince, and that King *John* granted 'em nothing but what was their due. If theſe Authors are not often quoted in the *Hall*, it is becauſe they are not *Caſe-reporters*; but conſider'd as Hiſtorical Collectors of the Old Law, they are certainly in this Caſe the beſt Evidence. Some Gentlemen may perhaps object, that theſe Laws are too old to be of Force, as they ſay, that ſome Precedents are too *Modern* to be good. But the Opinion of Chancellor *Forteſcu* is Antient enough to be venerable, and Modern enough to be credited.

The Chancellor in the *9th* Chapter tells the Prince of *Wales*, That *England is a Political Kingdom, and that the King governs by a Political Power*; *therefore he can't alter the Laws of the Kingdom.* C. 13. He tells the Prince, how a Political Kingdom is to be made; *A People that raiſe themſelves into a Kingdom, muſt ever appoint one to be the chief Ruler of the whole Body, which in Kingdom is called King.* Then he informs the Prince of the Original of this Political Kingdom of *England*, *viz.* That it was form'd from *Brutus* and his Companions. Then he informs by *whom*, and to what end this Political Kingdom was form'd, *viz. The King was made and ordain'd for the Defence of the Law of his Subjects, and of their Bodies and Goods, whereunto he receiveth Power from his PEOPLE*; *ſo that he cannot govern his PEOPLE by any other Power.* 'Tis plain, that *Forteſcu* thought the King deriv'd his Power from the *People*; and I much rely upon his Opinion, as being the moſt Learned and beſt of our Chancellors, *except the Preſent.* He liv'd at a time when the Title of the Crown was moſt canvaſſed, and beſt underſtood: He wrote for the Inſtruction of the *Heir Apparent*, was too great a Lawyer to miſtake the Fundamentals of our Conſtitution, and too faithful a Councellor to miſguide the Judgment of the Young Prince.

Wherefore, ſince it appears by the moſt ancient Monuments of the Conſtitution, that Limitations and Conditions were originally impoſed upon the King, and that the King upon his Demerits was removeable, which neceſſarily

ceſſarily implies an *Original Contract*, ſince Chancellor *Forteſcu* affirms, That the King of *England* was made King by, and receiv'd his Power from, the People, ſince by the *Magna Charta* of King *John*, the Right and Power of Dethroning Kings for Breach of the Contract, has been acknowledg'd and ſettled in the People: *The Original Contract* muſt needs have been between the *King* and the *People*, who gave the King Power to Govern, and reſerved a Right to themſelves to remove him for Tyranny; which Power and Right, have been enjoy'd by the People from the Original of Government in *England* down to this Day, as often as the *Neceſſity* of the Caſe compell'd them to make uſe of it.

But ſince ſome are endeavouring the Ruin of the State, by an upſtart Doctrine of the Church, it is with great Pleaſure I have read the Hiſtory of the *Church Reſiſtant*, *Proteſtant Catholick*, as well as *Roman Catholick*, and it is exceeding comfortable to me, who, with regard to my Duty towards God, think it a heinous Sin to Rebel againſt the Lawful Powers of a good Prince; and yet with reſpect to my Country, think my ſelf indiſpenſibly obliged to reſiſt the unlawful Acts of a Tyrant: to find, that this Doctrine of Non-Reſiſtance, (as now preached) is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, nor the true Senſe of the Homilies, that the Practice and Opinions of all the ſubſequent Convocations have been contrary; to find, that the true meaning of *Kings having their Power from God, is not, that they have any diſtinct Authority beſides the Law of the Land derived to them from God, but that by the Laws of God, the Authority of the Law of the Land, was ſecured to them: That the Laws of Religion in the Scripture, did only Eſtabliſh the ſeveral Conſtitutions and Governments that were in the different Parts of the World.* To find all this ſo well proved, in the incomparable Speech of the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and by the Opinions of the greateſt part of the *Sacred Bench*, to find the Truth force it ſelf out of the Mouths of the *Priſoner's Council*; who did all fully and plainly own, that in Caſes of extream Neceſſity, an exception of the Doctrine was to be admitted, and that ſuch was the Caſe of the *Revolution*; to find the *Revolution* juſtify'd, by thoſe who were brought there to arraign it, gives entire Satisfaction to my Conſcience, that I perform'd my Duty to my Country in reſiſting

ſiſting King *James*, without breaking the Law or Ordinance of God.

But you, *Doctor*, wave all Defences, but that of your Homilies: And of all their Expoſitors, the Opinion of Biſhop *Sanderſon* is propereſt for your Purpoſe, and the Spirit of it very agreeable to your Genius: I dare not be ſo *unmannerly* free with either dead or living *Prelates*, as you, you *dutiful Son of the Church*, nor do I believe, nor will I call Biſhop *Sanderſon* a falſe Son of the Church, or a *perfidious Prelate*, becauſe I think him out in one Opinion; which maintains that *defenſive Arms are* de toto genere *unlawful, and may not be taken up by any Man, at any time, in any Caſe, upon any Colour, or Pretenſion whatſoever, not for the Defence of Religion; nor for the Preſervation of a Church, or State, no, nor yet, if that could be imagin'd poſſible, for the Salvation of a Soul, no, not for the Redemption of the whole World.*

If this Doctrine be *Orthodox*, then Chriſt came into the World upon a *poor Errand*, to be *Crucified* for the *Redemption* of *Mankind*; which in this Biſhop's Opinion, is not of equal Conſideration with the Intereſts of a ſingle Man. I take this Doctrine to be ſo far from being Apoſtolical, that I make bold to affirm it to be a wild and blaſphemous *Rant*, and very proper to be burnt with Doctor *Sacheverell*'s *Blaſphemous Collections*.

As there are many Precedents to juſtifie Reſiſtance in the Hiſtory of the *Jews*, in whoſe Political Government God had ſuch an immediate Hand, as to condeſcend to be for ſome time even their King: I ſhall only give one Inſtance of the *Reſiſtance* that the *Maccabees* made againſt *Antiochus*, when he endeavour'd to make them break their Laws, by eating Swine's Fleſh, and attempted to introduce Idolatry into their Temples. This, in Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s Opinion, tho' to ſave their *Church*, and *Laws*, had not been ſufficient Cauſe to reſiſt, yet we ſee that God himſelf ſupported their juſt Cauſe, and by God's Aſſiſtance, they *quenched the Violence of Fire, eſcaped the Edge of the Sword, out of Weakneſs were made Strong, waxed valiant in Fight, turn'd to flight the Armies of the* Aliens*. Tho' St. *Paul* himſelf gives them theſe Encomiums, yet this Biſhop would make St. *Paul* ſay in another

* Thorndike, *p.* 306. *St.* Chryſoſtom, *Hom.* 27. in Epiſt. ad Heb. & alli.

Place, that they, and all those who *resist in any Case whatsoever*, were to receive to themselves Damnation.

I doubt not, if St. *Paul* were now living, but he would applaud the *Arms* of the *English* taken up against their *Antiochus*, because, as in the Case of the *Maccabees*, Idols were brought into our Church, and our Laws broken; and because *that God, even our own, and his God, has given 'em his Blessing.*

The Managers for the Doctor bring another Argument against the Revolution, and say, that they are proud of the Part they acted in it, and yet it was Rebellion, because if they had not succeeded, they would have been all Hang'd by the Laws. Undoubtedly, if a Tyrant gets the Upper-hand of the Subjects, he'll put 'em to Death without Mercy, and we know that King *James* had then a set of Judges, and some Bishops, who would have declar'd it both *Law* and *Gospel*. But those who consider the Authority of the Laws before-mentioned, will say, that King *James* upon his *Male administration* was *ipso facto no King*, and that there could be no *Rebellion* against him, to whom no *Allegiance* was due.

It seems strange to me, that Gentlemen should value themselves for being *Rebels*, yet I wish that some of them may not really *now* think, that *they deserve to be Hang'd* for having done so much at the Revolution. And it is to be apprehended, lest thro' a constant Reflection upon their *Rebellion*, and Injustice done to the late King, they may at last, thro' a Compunction of Conscience, think of some *Restitution*; and to make some amends for the Expulsion of the Father, at last propose a *Restoration* of the supposed Son.

This leads me to reflect, who have reviv'd this Doctrine, to what end it should be now trump'd up, and universally Preach'd? How is this *Doctrine wholesome and necessary for these Times?* When our Beloved Queen Reigns in the very *Souls* of all her People except *Sacheverell and Company*. I must observe, that the Author of the *Latin Sermon*, not contented to instil artfully this *Poisonous Doctrine* into the Ears of most of the Congregations about Town; but projecting to spread it universally, took an Opportunity to harangue the whole Clergy of *London* together. The Duty of the Day was forgot, the Design of the Preacher was only to defend, and recommend this

Doctrine

Doctrine to their particular Care; and in his *Dedication*, he gives them their *Cue*, and insinuates, that this Doctrine, by a *Common Consent*, and a *Common Concern*, is to be propagated.

Sacheverell's Part was to *set right* (as they cant) the young Clergy and Youth of the University. And these two Gentlemen have laboured so abundantly in their Provinces, that go to most Churches, and you'll be apt to think there's but *one Text* in the Bible, or that every Text speaks but *one Thing*.

Since this rank Weed has so *overspread*, and is so *deep-rooted* in the *University*, since a new set of *Professors* is establish'd to teach Jacobitism, since such Industry is used to breed up the young Nobility and Gentry in an Aversion to the true Principles of our *Constitution*; in an *Abhorrence* of the late *Revolution*, in a general *dislike* of the *Hannover* Succession, since they are become downright *Nurseries* of Parties and Factions, since even *Popery* it self begins to *peep* Abroad, something more must be done by the Parliament than burning their Decrees; or else a foreign Education will infallibly be the Consequence.

When was this Doctrine revived? Since the *Declension* of the Power of *France*, and a little before the *Scotch Expedition*. What are the necessary Consequences to be drawn from these Doctrines, if they were once settled? That the *Revolution* was founded in Iniquity, and that Injustice was done to King *James*, who ought not to have been resisted; then it will follow that King *William* and Queen *Mary* were Usurpers, that our rightful and lawful *Queen* is an *Usurper*, that there is another Brood of *Usurpers* coming over from *Hannover*, and that so much Blood and Money has been spent in an unjust War. These are the *odious* and *black Colours* that these Gentlemen *cast* upon the *Revolution* and the *present Government*. And to what purpose they do itat this Juncture, appears plainly, since now they have lost all hopes of carrying on the *Work* by a *French* Power.

Who were most concern'd for the good Success of *Sacheverell*'s *Doctrine* and *Tryal*? The *Non-jurors*, *Jacobites*, and *Papists*; who own this to be the fairest *Push* that ever was made for their Master? Who were the most remarkable Managers for the Doctor? Those who were for an *Administration* and *Regency*, and against the *Coronation*

of the P. of *O.* Thoſe, who put ſuch a ſudden ſtop to the laſt War, and were ſo unwilling to enter into this: Thoſe, who diſtreſs'd King *William* into the *Partition* Treaty, and afterwards thought it reaſonable to hang his Miniſters for it: And thoſe to a Man, who were againſt the Union, and now with their uſual Sinceriry pretend to be the Zealous Maintainers of it. How cloſe are all theſe united, and almoſt under Arms to defend this unknown and *worthleſs* Man! Hated by all who know him, for his Ingratitude and Preſumption, nay, they themſelves will tell you, 'tis not the *Man*, but the *Cauſe*, they *defend*. Since therefore we defend the Cauſe of the *Revolution*, I wiſh they would explain what *Cauſe* it is they *defend*.

It's remarkable, that *now* all private Quarrels are forgot, and open Enemies put Confidence in one another: No body hated *Sacheverell* more than the *Chief* of his own *Managers*; *Sacheverell* was never ſo bitter as upon a certain *falſe Brother*, whom he diſtinguiſh'd in his Sermon by the Name of the *Turncoat*: But for that Purpoſe, and *at that time*, Pilate *and* Herod *were made Friends*, *for before they were at Enmity between themſelves.*

Sacheverell, in his Speech, would make us believe, that 'tis impoſſible that he ſhould be a *Favourer* of the *Pretender*, becauſe he has *abjur'd* him. This indeed would be a good Argument in the Mouth of a Man of Probity; but ſince *Sacheverell* and his Managers allow of Mental Exceptions and Reſervations, we muſt examine this Matter. It is *now* well known, that ſome Gentlemen formerly, who would never qualify themſelves for the *Lieutenancy*, or the *Commiſſion* of the Peace, took all the Oaths to get into the *Houſe of Commons*, and had Diſpenſations for the Services which they were capable of doing there. There are now Circumſtances to make us believe, that the *Jacobite* Clergy have the like Inſtructions to take any Oaths, to get Poſſeſſion of a Pulpit for the Service of the *Cauſe*, to bellow out the *Hereditary Right*, the *pretended* Title of the *Pretender*. Have not the Non-jurors at this Juncture, and for this very Purpoſe taken the Oaths? Has not Parſon *H———s*, the moſt inveterate, and moſt impudent of the Non-jurors, juſt now done it; and did he not lately *out-brazen Sacheverell* himſelf, and no doubt but for the ſame Cauſe that *H———s*

has

has ſworn *Allegiance* to Queen *ANNE*, *Sacheverell* has *abjur'd* the Right of the *Pretender*. We know that the one allows the *Defactoſhip* of the Queen, and the other reſerves to himſelf the *Divine Right* of the Pretender. *Sacheverell* ſays, that he has given *Publick Demonſtrations* of his *True Zeal* for her Majeſty, by defending her Title to the Crown. Which he does thus in his *Oxford* Sermon; he allows, *That by a long Succeſſion of Her Royal Anceſtors*, an Hereditary Right *has been devolved upon Her*, and ſays very truly, That *even her very worſt Enemies will acknowledge it*, as he himſelf, and Mr. *Leſlie*, who was the firſt Defender of this *Title*. Ask the Gentlemen at St. *Germains* what Title their Maſter has to the Crown of *Great Britain*, they'll ſay his *Hereditary Right devolved upon him from his Royal Anceſtors?* Ask *Sacheverell* what Right the Queen has to the Crown, he anſwers, Her *Hereditary Right devolved upon her from Her Royal Anceſtors?* But if theſe Advocates ſhould ever meet, they'd ſoon reconcile theſe Difficulties, and *compound* the Two Hereditary Rights into *One*. *Sacheverell*, *Leſlie*, and the Queen's *new Council Extraordinary*, maintain Her *Hereditary Right* to the Crown, becauſe they pretend to *know* that there is a *nearer Heir*: 'Tis for this they labour to make the Crown hang upon Her Head, only by that *Slipknot* of *Hereditary Right*, when it's ſo hard bound on by Parliament. And if that Point could be once gain'd, they are ready, no doubt, to produce *their Immediate Heir*; and thus theſe *Councellors*, a ſet of *Falſe Brethren*, that the Doctor takes no notice of, whilſt they pretend to be of Council for the Queen, only *open* and *ſet forth* the Title of Her *Adverſary*. It's thus that *theſe Defenders* will allow the *Hereditary Right* of the *Hannover* Family, becauſe they know that even the Houſe of *Bourbon* is before them.

The King and Parliament have always had, and uſed a Power of ſettling, directing and binding the Deſcent of the Crown in the Royal Blood, different from the common courſe of other Inheritances, (it was Treaſon to deny this by the *13th* of *Elizabeth*, which Act in ſubſtance is revived by the late Act of the Queen) who often have prefer'd the *Mediate* Heir to the *Immediate*, as lately the Queen was advanced before the Pretender, without taking notice of his Illegitimacy. The Houſe

of

of *Hannover*, before the House of *Savoy*. When *Sacheverell* and his *Managers* talk upon this Point, they are just upon the brink of Treason, puzled to bring it out, and labouring to with-hold it.

Mr. *Hoadly*, who, to his Honour, has incurr'd the Malice of the whole Party, and been recommended by their Satyr to the Parliament, and by the Parliament in a very honourable manner to the Queen, has admirably expos'd the Self-Contradictions of one of them, in the Appendix to his last Book: There he brings in the *Dean*, desiring, *That the Clergy may be put in Heart, and be at Hand always, to stand up with them,* (viz. *the Laity*) *and to Resist a growing Tyranny, either in Church or State.* Mr. *Hoadly* is not able to reconcile this Doctrine, with that contain'd in the *Latin* Sermon: But tho such inconsistent Principles are irreconcileable, yet if we consider the Circumstances of Time, we may account for them; because it seems to be much the same Design that made him print that Doctrine *then*, that has made him preach this Doctrine *now*. That Book was printed in 1700. then K. *W.* was upon the Throne, and the *Hannover Succession* upon the *Anvil*; then Mr. *Dean* was *ready to resist a growing Tyranny in Church and State*. The *Latin* Sermon I hear was first preach'd in *English* about 1708. then it was a damnable Sin to *resist their Hereditary Right*, who was about that time on board the *Mars*.

Rights and Powers of English *Convocation*, Ed. 1. p. 105.

Since the Doctor complains so much of *his hard Fortune to be misunderstood*, and other *hard Circumstances* of his Impeachment, I must here enumerate some of his Felicities: First, he sent to *Oxford* for a *Testimonium* of his Loyalty and good Behaviour; they, it seems, were so much inclin'd in his Favour, as only to deny it; and so backward, as not to draw up an *Information* against him. Next, he had the Confidence to appeal to a noble Lord in his Speech, the Bishop of *Litchfield* and *Coventry*, for his Character, after which Day the Bishop charitably absented from the House, apprehending (as 'tis supposed) that he might be called upon, to give a Character of him, which would have been such, ('tis believed) as would have made out the Criminal Intention laid in the Impeachment. If this be not true, 'twould be much to the

Do-

Doctor's Reputation, yet to procure a Testimonial from the Bishop. Is it not a peculiar Happiness that has attended the Doctor thro' the Course of his Trial? That tho' he challenges the World to shew any *Indication of his Dislike* to the *Protestant Succession*, to prove any *favourable Expressions towards the Pretender, or Aspersions upon the Memory of the late King*. No body appeared to prove, that this *innocent* Doctor had said that King *William* deserved to be *Dewitted*, and that he had curst him for his Legacy, the *Hannover* Succession.

To conclude this Article, let us consider this *Loyal* and *Faithful Subject*; this *Sincere Protestant*, associated in Principles with *Jacobites*, *Papists*, *Juring*, *Non-juring*, and (what's worse) *such abjuring Clergy*, let us consider this *Defender* of the Queen's Title, who waves her Parliamentary Limitation, to rest it only upon an *Hereditary Right*. Let us consider this Friend to the Protestant Succession, who ridicules the Parliamentary Right under the Name of the *Right of the People*, and the Title of the *Mob, taught by new Preachers and new Politicians*; when it's certain, that the House of *Hannover* has its Title by Parliament: Let us consider the Scope of the Sermon, and we cannot but say it was to condemn the *Revolution*; and if the Doctor is guilty of any of these ill Intentions, he is in a most deplorable Condition, and has *now* more occasion for the Prayers of the Church, as under a State of *Reprobation*, than when under an *Imaginary* Persecution.

ARTICLE II.

THE Managers against the Doctor say, that in Page 8, 9. among the several sorts of *False Brethren, with relation to God, Religion and the Church*, enumerated by the Doctor, those *who defend Toleration, and a Liberty of Conscience* are comprehended. The Doctor himself has not sworn off the Intention to condemn *a Toleration*, but owns in his Speech, *That what he may have said offensive of that, cannot be adjudged to reflect on the Act of Exemption*. Here the Doctor only *distinguishes* himself *off*, by saying, that he reflected only upon *A Toleration*, and not *The Toleration*, or Legal Indulgence, which looks to me more like a Quibble than a Distinction. He says, that he cannot be thought

thought to reflect upon the Act of Parliament, because there is no Act of *Toleration*. Does not the Doctor and his *Managers* continually tell us of the *Test Act?* And tho' there's no Act so entitl'd, yet we understand what Act they mean; as they understand us, when we talk of the *Toleration Act*, to mean that Act of the First of *William* and *Mary*, Is there a necessity either in Speaking or Writing, to use such a Circumlocution? as to say, *(The Act for exempting Their Majesty's Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of* England, *from the Penalties of certain Laws)* as often as there is occasion to speak of the *Toleration*, Do not our publick Instruments run thus? Has not the Queen promis'd, that she will *inviolably maintain the Toleration?* But the Doctor takes this to be one of his *hard Fortunes*, that the Lords his Judges, should understand this Word, or any other Words, or Passages of his Sermon, in the common Sense that the rest of Mankind do. The Doctor says, there's no such thing as a *Toleration Act*, because the word *Toleration implies more than the Law-givers design'd to grant:* The Act says in *Section* 8. that such *Persons shall be exempted from Penalties for the Exercise of Religion, Permitted and Allowed by this Act.* Which seem to be more favourable Words than *Tolerated*; *Allowance*, in my humble Opinion implying *Approbation*; *Toleration* only a bare Sufferance.

Let us here examine how the Doctor treats the Dissenters, if not his *Brethren*, at least his neareſt *Relations* in Christ. It wou'd be tedious to repeat all the nasty Names he bestows upon 'em, but let us observe the History that he gives of 'em in Page 20. First he pretends to give you the Original of these *Miscreants begot in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and nursed up in Faction*; then he tells you, they are grown up to be *almost Christians, Seditious, and Schismatical Impostors*; and then they became *Wretched, Empty, Hypocritical Sophisters:* Then he tells you what is to be done with them; they are to be *treated like growing Mischiefs*, and *infectious Plagues.* Then he disposes of 'em, conducts 'em to *Hell, and there settles 'em.* This is the Liberty of Speech that the Doctor takes, yet how barbarous was it, to call him only a *Tool of a Party.* In how Christian-like manner have these *Dissenters* born these Revilings? With what Resignation and Primitive Patience have they endured the late Insults and Injuries done 'em?

Sure

Sure *Self-defence* is lawful againſt Midnight *Incendiaries*, Plunderers, Rioters, Felons, and Rebels; yet how did theſe People, *bred up in the Principles of Rebellion*, defend themſelves, but by Flight? Have theſe *Clamorous*, *Church-devouring Malignants*, even ſo much as complain'd of the *Church-men*, who rais'd this *Mob*. Have theſe *profeſs'd Enemies of the Queen*, undutifully remonſtrated to her, that the publick Faith of the Nation has been violated, by the Indignities lately done to their Religious Worſhip? Have they murmured at their Loſſes? Or petition'd the Parliament for a Recompenſe? So dutiful has been their Behaviour!

The Modern *Laudeans* can ſcarce hear the Word *Reformation*; which their Predeceſſors formerly call'd a *Deformation*. But *this Toleration* will be for ever odious, becauſe it was introduced by the late King; and Moderation will be always call'd *Cant*, becauſe it came lately from the *Throne*. The firſt *will undermine the Church*, the laſt *will* blow it up. The *Pag.* 16, & 17. Project of *Comprehenſion*, undertook by ſome of the beſt Clergy in *England*, muſt be call'd a *Monſtrous*, *and villainous Scheme of theſe Eccleſiaſtical Achitophels*, *to fill the Church* with unhallow'd, *Pagan Beaſts* (i.e. *Diſſenters*) *inſtead of Chriſtians*; but how favourably have theſe Gentlemen received, and how willing are they to give into, the famous *Project of Reconciliation with the* Gallican *Church?*

From which they think the *Church of* England parted but with a thin Veil: But, if it be true, that ſome *French Clergymen*, have a mind to meet us, I wiſh we had 'em in exchange for ſome of our *High-flying Clergy*; who are more than enclin'd to *run* over to them. And for this reaſon you may believe 'em, when they ſay they would rather be *Papiſts* than *Presbyterians*.

It's well known how they lament the loſt Power of the Church, which they apprehend will never be retriev'd by a Toleration, or the *Hannover*-Succeſſion; we ſee how they endeavour to advance their Authority, and to bully us, with their *Anathema*'s; we know that ſome of 'em *blaſphemouſly* repine at the want of the *miraculous Power* of the Church, in the firſt Century. How *flouriſhing*, ſay they, would be the State of the Church, how *Triumphant here upon Earth*, if we had once more the Power to ſend our Enemies *quick* down to Hell!

But God is so gracious to us, as not *now* to entrust these High-flying *Ambassadors* with such *full Powers*, considering, that he has given them at present too little Grace, Mercy and Charity to manage them. If *Sacheverell*'s Loins were girt with this *Flaming-Sword*, he, who says, That *Princes should answer with the Sword, and the Church with* Anathema's; it wou'd be doubted whether he would look like an *Overseer sent by the Holy Ghost*, or rather like a *destroying Angel*. I'll pass by the scurrilous Language given to Bishop *Grindal*, and tell the Doctor one Secret, that if he had lived and so scandaliz'd the Hierarchy in *Haughty Laud*'s Days, he would infallibly have gotten that *indelible Mark*, on both sides of his Head, which Mr. *Burton* had for the very same Crime, notwithstanding his *sacred Character*. Which ought to make the Doctor to forbear upbraiding the *Lords* with *fear* to punish, because their Mercy was so unparalell'd, as *almost* to forgive.

ARTICLE III.

AS to the Third Article, the Doctor justifies the Danger of the *Church*, and humbly opposes his single Opinion against the general Sense of the Queen, and the two Houses of Parliament, and maintains it to their Faces. But denies, that he design'd to blacken that *Vote of Parliament* which declared the Church to be out of Danger, by comparing it with the *Vote*, that *declared King* Charles's *Person out of Danger*; and wou'd avoid, that he intended to *insinuate that the Members of both Houses, who pass'd the said Vote, about the Safety of the Church, were then conspiring the Ruin of the Church.*

A Vote having pass'd in Parliament, declaring *the Church out of Danger*, the Doctor durst not arraign that Vote directly. And yet some way must be found to *blacken* it; and no way was thought so proper, as to compare it to that *Vote which declared King* Charles *out of Danger*; with this Addition of the Doctor's, only to make the Application, *that at the same time his Murderers were conspiring his Death.* This he knew would bring consequential Scandal upon it, and insinuate, what was not safe to affirm expressly; that the Members of Parliament were contriving the Ruin of the Church, when they *Voted it*

out of Danger, becauſe every Body knows, that the Parliament which made that Vote about King *Charles*, did conſpire his Murder. But the Doctor ſays, that they who voted the King's Perſon out of Danger, were not the very ſame Perſons who contrived his Murder, and therefore he cou'd not make the *Inſinuation*. Tho' the Compariſon ſhould not exactly run upon *all four* when examined, yet the Doctor deſign'd to make that Inſinuation, by giving juſt as much of the Hiſtory as ſerv'd for that purpoſe, and if it ſhould be true, that but a *Remnant*, or a few of that Parliament, which voted the King out of Danger, were the Contrivers of his Murder, yet ſtill it will ſerve the Doctor's End by way of Compariſon, for in Parliamentary Language it was ſtill the ſame *Houſe*, and differ'd no more, than a *thin Houſe* from a *full one*, and therefore it was the *ſame Houſe*, ſome Members only abſent, that voted the King out of Danger, and conſpired his Murder.

The great Deſign of the Sermon was to undermine the Queen's Title to the Crown, to aſperſe her Adminiſtration both in Spirituals and Temporals, and to traduce the late Parliament, and for each Article he has provided a *Parallel* by way of Illuſtration. To ſtigmatize the Church under the *Government* of the preſent Biſhops, he ſays, *It is very obvious to draw a Parallel here*, betwixt the *ſad Circumſtances of the Church of* Corinth *formerly*, *and of the Church of* England *at preſent*; and *this is done without Diſcouragement, he is ſure with Impunity by our pretended Friends and falſe Brethren*; who the *pretended Friends* are, which ought to diſcourage, and are able to puniſh Schiſms, except thoſe *falſe Brethren*, the Biſhops, I don't well know.

To diſhonour the laſt Parliament, he compares their *Vote* about the Church to the Vote of the *Rump*-Parliament about King *Charles*'s Perſon.

At laſt alluding to the preſent Times, he thinks to come home to the Queen by a notable Parallel, when he ſays, That *tho' the Ways of* Zion *may mourn for a time*, *and her Gates be deſolate*, her Prieſts ſigh, and lie in Bitterneſs, *becauſe her Adverſaries are Chief*, *and her Enemies* AT PRESENT proſper, (At PRESENT foiſted into the Text only to make the Application evident) this is the *Lamentation* of the Prophet, when *Judah* was gone in-

to *Captivity*, the King in a foreign Country, and an *Usurper* upon the *Throne*. Can any Body think that this Gentleman had no *ill* Intention, tho' he *swears* it, or no Design at *all*, as his *Managers* say, in so many Reflections upon the Queen and Ministry, so *artfully* cover'd, and so *methodically* digested into *Parallels?*

To shew the *Danger of the Church*, the Doctor gives us this Character of the present Age, *For besides that Deluge of Prophaneness and Immorality, which overspread the whole Kingdom*; *besides the Variety of those* Schisms, *Heterodox Opinions, and damnable Heresies, which are daily publish'd and propagated among us*; *I verily believe, that never were the Ministers of Christ so abused, and vilified, never was the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures so Arraign'd, and Ridiculed, never were Infidelity and Atheism so impudent and bare-faced, never were such horrid Blasphemies printed in any Christian State, from the Foundation of Christianity to this Day.* So much of the Doctor's Speech I'll justify to be his own genuine Product; so elegantly he always declames, so honestly he represents, so charitably he judges of his Neighbours, if a Stranger were to read this, he wou'd be apt to think, that there was ne'er a good Man in *Great Britain* besides the pious Doctor *Sacheverell*, *so general is the Deluge of Prophaneness*, that he must be the *Abraham* to intercede for us.

Speech, *p.* 7.

If our Neighbours believe this Man, they must gaze at us in Expectation of our immediate Destruction, as a People more abandon'd than ever *Sodom* was. If Posterity believes the execrable Report of this *Defamer*, they'll be asham'd of their Ancestors.

Are not we, even *now*, consider'd as a *Church*, the very Pride and Boast of the Reformation? Are not we, consider'd as a *People*, the honourable Head of the United Body of *Christendom?* Yet, Doctor *Sacheverell* says, there was never any such wicked *Christian State*, *from the Foundation of Christianity to this Day.*

Is not the Church (thus traduced by this *her Dutiful Son*) the main Strength and Bulwark against Popery? When was there greater Care or Piety shewn for propagating the Reform'd Religion, than at this Day? When were our Churches at Home better fill'd, or with a greater Appearance of real Devotion? When, or in what

Church

Church of the World, were seen such large, liberal Charities, as are at this Day for educating poor Children in Religion and Virtue? And tho' Vice and Immorality has been always too prevailing, yet there never was a time so proper for the Doctor's purpose, to charge the Nation with it, as under the Queen's Administration.

Now the *Managers* have Recourse to the Doctor's *Godly Collections*, which they call Proofs of the general Corruption of the Nation, in Matters of Religion; and on that Head are brought the abortive Labours of that great *Billinsgate Logician*, *Edmund Hick*——, of that *Crackbrain'd* Projector *Asgill*, of that poor *Poet Gildon*, of that *Atheistical* Vagabond *Toland*, and of that Eminent Statesman *John Tuchin*, lately defunct.

Here the Doctor has learned of Esq; *Bickerstaff*, to engage with the dangerous Shadows of the Church's Enemies, chalk'd out upon the Wall: Are the Writings of these two or three insignificant Fellows, sufficient Grounds for an honest Man to charge a whole Nation with *Atheism* and *Infidelity?* But by the Doctor's Logick, all Men are Irreligious, because a few are so: But the Managers against the Doctor say, that all the Passages which are quoted in the *Collections*, to make out the present danger of the Church, prove no *new* danger of the Church, since the passing of that Vote, which was in 1705. because all those Books were wrote and printed long before 1705, and shew that the Administration has been so vigilant, that the Books and their Authors have been all censured and punish'd.

The good Bishop of *London* very justly prosecuted that abominable Brute *Hickeringhill*, to his damage of 20000 *l.* if such a Fellow were to be believed. I am apt to think, if the Doctor had known *Hickeringhill*'s Principles before that Prosecution, he would have spared him, as well as the rest of the Blaspheming *High-flyers*; for *Hickeringhill* was once (in the Doctor's Sense) *a true Son of the Church*, as appear'd in that sawcy Dialogue he made, between Capt. *Edmund Hickeringhill*, *Rector of All Saints in* Colchester, *and his Friend* Cornet Compton, *Bishop of* London. *Asgill* has been punish'd both in *England* and *Ireland* for his Maggot, *Gildon* is more than half starved by several long Imprisonments, and Mr. *Blunt* has already accounted to God for his Errors. The *Observator* was prosecuted in

Westminster

Westminster Hall, and escap'd the Pillory but by a Mistake of a Figure; and if any Minister was then Lazy, I doubt it will fall upon the then Attorney-General.

The Rights of the Christian Church having expos'd the Principles of some of the Clergy, who are for setting up an Independency in the *Church*, has justly incurr'd their Displeasure; and if the *House* had not burn'd the Book, for one unwary Passage, the *Universities*, who have had it long under their Consideration, were resolved to do it for the whole, as soon as they had answer'd it. I confess I never heard of the Anonimous Books in the *Collections*, and as I had forgot the others, I shou'd certainly never have known these, if the Doctor had not taken this Method to republish, and perpetuate 'em in the Record of the Trial.

If the Doctor had been sincere enough to have pointed to the real Danger of the Church, he shou'd not have forgot Mr. *Dodwell*'s Book about the *Natural Mortality of the Soul*, &c. Which has shock'd the very Foundation of Christianity, he is a Gentleman of such extraordinary Learning, such a Philosopher, such an Historian, and so accurate in Polemical Divinity, that his Writings are of great Authority with the Learned themselves, and unquestioned by the Ignorant. How fatal then must an Atheistical Position prove? When advanced, and defended with so much Plausibility, and so many seeming Arguments as that prodigious Man is furnished with. This is attended too, by another melancholly Circumstance, That neither the *Great South*, the Learned *Smaldridge*, nor the Divine Pen of *Atterbury*, who see so clearly the Church and her Sons in Danger; have in the least enlighten'd, or assisted us poor *Lay-folks*, against so dangerous a Prepossession. What can be the reason of this, but that the zealous Jacobite, attones for the dangerous Atheist?

The same doubtless is the true Reason, why so many scandalous and obnoxious Passages in the Books of *Leslie*, *Hicks* and others, have escap'd the Censure of the Doctor's Collections: The Compilers of that extraordinary Piece, might almost in every Page of those Factious Turbulent Writers, have found the most virulent Reflections on the whole Body of the Clergy: Taxing them with downright Atheism, and Infidelity, prostituting

their

their Faith and Conſciences for the Hopes of ſome Temporal Profit or Preferment, and giving up their Flocks and their own Souls to the Men in Power. In theſe Authors they might ſee the Supremacy of the Crown turn'd into Ridicule, and abus'd in the moſt opprobrious, villanous Terms: They might ſee the Reformation expos'd and traduc'd in Terms that even the Papiſts would bluſh to uſe, and all our firſt Reformers repreſented as a Pack of Mercenaries, who would ſell the Church for Gold: And ſuch advances made towards Popery, that even their own Miſſionaries durſt not barefacedly make ſuch forward Steps: But all this and much more is allow'd, nay approv'd, in Men ſo eminently ſerviceable to the Pretender.

Next to prove the *Danger of the State*, the Doctor produces ſome Paſſages out of the Obſervator and Review, which reflect upon the Queen, State, and Miniſtry. One of theſe Authors has been already pillory'd, and the other very narrowly miſs'd it. And if the Queen and the Miniſtry were ſo happy as to have no *other*, or no more dangerous Enemies, than theſe two Authors, I wou'd venture to declare the Queen and Government out of Danger. But why was the famous *Application* forgot here, when the Doctor was collecting the dangerous Writings againſt the Queen and State? I fear the Doctor was too intimate with the Promoter of that Treaſonable Remonſtrance, againſt the *Queen's Power of Proroguing the Convocation*, which *illegal Practices* produced the ſevereſt Reprimand to the *Lower-Houſe*, that ever came out of Her Majeſty's moſt Gracious Mouth.

Application of the Lower-Houſe *of* Convocation *in* 1707.

Do not the Deductions drawn from the Book Entitled, *The Rights*, &c. *of the* Engliſh *Convocation*, tend to deprive the Queen of her Supremacy? Do not the other Writings of that Author, encourage the inferior Clergy to rebel againſt the Biſhops their Superiors and Governors? And perſwade the whole Body of the Clergy, to ſeparate it ſelf from its *ſupream Head*, by inſinuating, that the Clergy is independent of the Temporal Power, to the manifeſt Invaſion of the Queen's Eccleſiaſtical Prerogatives? The Queen, who is truly the *Nurſing Mother* of the Church, ſeems to be fonder of her *Supremacy* than of

any

any other Jewel in her Crown, it was with great Difficulties, that our Anceſtors wrenched it out of the Hands of *ancient Popiſh* Clergy, to place it upon the Heads of our Kings, (as too bright for any other) nothing was able to fix it there, but making it Capital to deny it. And now ſome of our *modern* Clergy are endeavouring ſlily to ſteal it back again, while others lay violent Hands upon it.

ARTICLE IV.

THE Managers at *Tom*'s make out the firſt part of the fourth Article out of their own Words, *pag.* 15. Where you affirm, that there are *falſe Brethren in Church and State, who do weaken, and undermine, and betray in themſelves, and encourage, and put it in the Power of our profeſſed Enemies to overturn, and deſtroy the Conſtitution of both.* Then, that we may know whom you mean by theſe *Falſe Brethren*, you explain your ſelf in *Page* 22. That as to *falſe Brotherhood in regard to the World* or State, we may *ſee Men of Character, and Stations, ſhift and prevaricate with their Principles, ſtart from their Religion upon any occaſion of Difficulty, or Trial, and like the Diſciples, flying from, and forſaking our Saviour when his Life lay at ſtake. What can unwary Perſons conclude from ſuch Tergiverſation, and Hypocriſy, but that all Religion is State-craft, and Impoſture?* To give ſtill a higher Notion of theſe *Falſe Brethren*, the *Men of Characters and Stations*, he advertiſes, *pag.* 18. *Our Governors, of the Falſhood, and Treachery, as the Qualifications of thoſe, who are entruſted with the Guardianſhip of our Church and State*, for fear Her Majeſty's Lay-Miniſters only ſhou'd ſeem to be implied in what he has already ſaid, an After-thought in a Dedication was printed, to beſpatter Her Majeſty's Adminiſtration in Eccleſiaſtical, as well as Civil Affairs. For this purpoſe the Doctor ſays, That *our Conſtitution, i. e.* Church and State, *is ſo vigorouſly attacked from without, and ſo lazily defended from within.* Here the Managers againſt the Doctor want to be informed who are they, who in the Doctor's Opinion ſo vigorouſly attack the Church. I'll appeal to thoſe who have converſed with the Party, whether they don't think the Miſcarriage of the *Application*, to be the greateſt Wound the Church ever received; whether they don't

call

call them *Enemies* to the Church, who have acquiesced under the Queen's Prerogative of Proroguing of the Convocation, and rail at those, who obstruct the Sitting of the *so long called for Convocation.* Who have own'd the Queen's Prerogative, or who are Judges of the Necessity of the Meeting of the Convocation, but the Queen's faithful Councellors, the Bishops? Who justly apprehend the ill Consequence of letting so many distemper'd Minds meet together, as may be found in that Assembly, whom the Queen has already charged with *a plain Invasion of her Supremacy*, and branded *with want of Duty to her, as well as to their Superiors.*

Queen's Letter to the Convocation, 1707.

If the Party will allow the Queen her Supremacy, she must be the only Defender of the Faith and Church; and as the Queen does nothing but by an Administration, and for that purpose the Bishops are the proper Ministers, I doubt it's too plain, that the Doctor takes their Lordships to be the *Lazy Defenders.* Then the Doctor goes on, and in Page 2. he says, that the Church is *not only to encounter the open Fury and Violence of her profess'd Enemies, but is to be betray'd and perfidiously given up by her own false hearted and insidious Apostles.* These Apostles of the Church, who were in the foregoing Page *vigorous Attackers* and *lazy Defenders*, are now become false-hearted and insidious Apostles; and a little forwarder he says, that *such is the hard fortune of the Church, her worst Adversaries must be let into her Bowels, under the holy Umbrage of Sons, who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy.* The Doctor bestows the Title of *Son* of the Church on none but himself, as *the dutiful Son of the Church*; and the Prelates, as *that false Son of the Church Bishop* Grindal.

I must recapitulate his Charge upon the Bishops, *the false Sons*, who vigorously *Attack* and lazily *Defend* the Church, her worst Adversaries, false hearted, and insidious Apostles, who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy. If our Hierarchy were so detestable as the Doctor has represented it, I should think the Church in the extreamest Peril; and if our Nation were so *universally corrupted*, there would be too much reason to apprehend God's Vengeance.

The Managers for the Doctor answer all this by telling you, that by those *Men of Characters and Stations*, the Doctor only meant *Church-wardens*, *Sidesmen*, *Constables*, and some Justices of the Peace, whose Civil Administration had given great Offence to the Doctor. I confess I knew not the Dignity, Authority and Power of those Magistrates, till I was inform'd by them, that Church-wardens and Sidesmen being *entrusted with the Guardianship of the Church*, have a Power in *themselves to weaken and undermine it*, and an opportunity to put in such *False Sons* as *Bishop* Grindal *to betray it*. A Constable's Office was never before now thought to be such a *Station and Character*, as that he, in *himself* cou'd, or was able *to put it in the Power of our profess'd Enemies to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment* of either Church or State.

The Doctor himself apprehended this Turn to be ridiculous, and makes a more colourable Defence in his Speech; he argues very speciously, that a Man who has *printed* so many respectful Expressions, and paid so many Compliments to the Ministry, cannot be guilty of defaming them, and that nothing ought to be received in Evidence against *such publick Demonstrations as he had given*. 'Tis true, the Doctor did commend the *Happy Administration of the Government*, *and the refin'd Policies of the Parliament and Ministry*, in Page 23. of a Sermon printed in 1702. then we know the Doctor was pretty well pleased with the Queen, and entirely satisfy'd with the *refin'd Policies of the Ministry*. The Doctor is charged with defaming the Ministry in 1710, and he answers, that can't be, for I commended the Ministry in 1702. Upon this and other Passages some People don't stick to say, that notwithstanding the Doctor's Asseverations, the whole Speech is evasive and false, without one sincere tittle in it: And if the Doctor *has been made to speak* (as he complains, *p.* 5. in his Speech) *what he never thought of*, it was done by the Makers of his Speech, when they made him pray for the House of *Hannover*, and deny his Reflections upon the present Administration.

But the Doctor to purge himself fully takes a short Method; to prepare your Belief tells you of his Holy Mission from *GOD*, and his Commission from the *Holy Ghost*: Then lifting up his Eyes and Hands to Heaven, he appeals to the *dreadful Tribunal*, *at which He*, *and all the World are*

are to be Judged; *called the* Searcher of Hearts *to witneſs, in the moſt Solemn and Religious manner*, that he was Innocent of any Deſign to *defame the Queen's Adminiſtration*, or Miniſtry. This ſolemn Appeal to God, before ſuch a Venerable Aſſembly, with ſo many Religious Circumſtances, pronounc'd with ſo much Vehemence, and ſuch ſincere Behaviour of a Chriſtian, works ſo ſtrongly upon me, that my Charity has blinded my Senſes, and makes me pray for his Soul's ſake, That he ſpoke nothing but the Truth. Yet ſome Gentlemen, who pretend to know the *Man*, to know his *Meaning*, who affirm, that he has expreſly *named* one Miniſter in Page 22. who have a Key to his *Men of Character and Stations, his Guardians of the Church and Crown*, deſire to be excuſed, if they can't believe a Proteſtation, tho' never ſo Solemn, againſt a Matter of Fact. They ſay further, that ſome of your Managers were aſtoniſh'd, and trembled at the Oath, and have own'd that you were chiefly employ'd to beſpatter the preſent *Miniſtry*, and ſome few finding their Party ſo ſtrong, are now angry with you for recanting it; but you have infinitely recommended your ſelf to others by it, who think you now a moſt *uſeful* Perſon.

The latter part of the *4th* Article is made out by the *Derby* Dedication.

'Now, when the *Principles* and *Intereſts* of our *Church* 'and *Conſtitution*, are ſo ſhamefully *Betray'd* and *Run* 'down, it can be no little *Comfort* to thoſe who *wiſh* their '*Welfare* and *Security*, to ſee, that notwithſtanding the '*Secret Malice* and *Open Violence* they are perſecuted 'with, there are ſtill to be found ſuch *Worthy Patrons* 'of both, who dare *Own* and *Defend* them, as well a-'gainſt the *Rude* and *Preſumptuous Inſults* of the *One ſide*, 'as the *Baſe undermining Treachery* of the *other*; and 'who ſcorn to ſit Silently by, and partake in the Sins of 'theſe *aſſociated Malignants*.

'Tho' the *Truth* ſeems to be ſo much forſaken at pre-'ſent, yet, God be thank'd, They ſhall yet find, to our 'Honour, That we have ſtill amongſt Us thoſe who have '*Courage* to ſpeak it, as well as thoſe who have *Lives* and '*Fortunes* to maintain it: And tho' the Age is ſunk into

'the *lowest Dreggs of Corruption*, that it cannot endure 'sound Doctrine, there are not wanting some to *Preach* 'it, and others to *Support* it, at the Expence of *Both*. 'May the *Influence* of good *Examples*, which as much 'animates our *Friends* as it terrifies our *Enemies*, be as dif- 'fusively prevailing as 'tis nobly conspicuous, and the 'Blessing of that *Church* attend you, which you so emi- 'nently *adorn* and *sustain*.

Here we are told from the Pulpit, That *the Principles of our Church and Constitution are shamefully betray'd and run down with secret Malice, and open Violence.* Is not this to *instil Fears and Jealousies* into weak Minds, and to make each Man suspect the other of Secret Designs? And are not these Fears and Jealousies *groundless?* When our *Church* is in a most *Flourishing* Condition, and the Constitution of our State strengthen'd by so many good Laws, and our good Queen ready to give what more we desire.

When he says there are some *who scorn to sit Silently by, and partake in the Sins of these associated Malignants*, does he not *knavishly divide* the People by the Distinction of *Malignants?* and does he not tell us in his Sermon, who those Church-devouring Malignants are? And does he not immediately threaten those *associated Malignants?* And tell 'em, that *they shall find, to our Honour, that we have still among Us, those who have* Courage *to speak it, as well as those who have Lives and Fortunes to maintain it.* Does he not here blow the Trumpet? Does he not here muster his Forces? Does he not here inform us how resolute some are *to maintain it with their Lives*, and how able others are *to support it with their Fortunes?* Here he *excites and stirs them up to Arms:* Here he directs them to the Enemy, by pointing out to the *associated Malignants*; and at last very Piously gives 'em *the Blessing of the Church to attend them* in the good Enterprize.

These godly Exhortations have had the design'd Success, and open Rebellion has been the immediate Consequence; but the Doctor again professes in the Presence of God, That *it was without any Fault of his, or the least Encouragement given by him.* This seems to some People to be another *rash Oath*, who say, that the Sermon influenc'd, and the Doctor's indiscreet Behaviour afterwards *encou-*

rag'd

rag'd the Mob, but his *Managers* say in his behalf, that when the *Gentry of White-Fryars* attended him at his Chambers, and were so respectful to pull off their Caps to him, he could not be so rude as not to bow to 'em: That he could not refuse the Compliment of his Sollicitor, Bail, Council and Friends, to attend him with their Equipages, before and behind, like Guards, to the *Hall*; and who could prevent his ungovernable Footmen from hollowing themselves, and making the *Mob* do so too: He never thought this would *give the least Encouragement*; it was but Christian-like, to desire the Prayers of the Church when under Persecution; and but Politick, to lay the Persecution upon the *Dissenters*.

The Doctor himself, (as well as the rest of the World) thinks that the *Charge of wickedly wresting divers Texts of Scripture, lies very hard upon him, as a Christian and a Minister of Christ*: Yet, he seems to me to stand very *easy* under it; when to clear his *Holy Character* of so *foul a Blot*, which he *Speech*, p. 21. apprehends, if he were *even acquitted, must leave a Scar upon his good* Name; when, to support an Opinion of his Integrity, *whose whole Capacity of doing good in the World*, (he says) *principally depends upon it*; not one word has been suggested in his Defence or Excuse, but he again appeals to *another Tribunal* to be judged by, when the Sun is not plainer at Noon-Day, than several Perversions of Scripture in his Sermon. But, *he hopes*, indeed, *that those, whose particular Profession, and Studies qualify 'em to be the most Competent Judges of such Matters, will absolve him in this Particular.* If by being *absolved*, the Doctor should mean, to be *acquitted* of wresting the Scriptures, I believe the *most Competent Judges* will not absolve him; but if by *Absolving*, he means only *Forgiving*, he need not fear but that, whether he Perverts or Blasphemes the Scriptures, whether his Appeals to God be true or false, for any Wickedness he has done, or shall do, nay, if he were capable of Assassination, he may be fully absolved, whilst such good Confessors as *Cook*, *Snat*, and *Collier* are living.

I have not yet heard any of his Managers deny his corrupting the Scriptures; none yet, but himself, have arriv'd to that invincible Impudence, it will soon appear by the excellent Speech of one of the Managers, how

he

he Abuſes them ſometimes by adding, ſometimes by leaving out Words and Sentences; ſometimes he miſcites Paſſages of Holy Writ, and always wickedly miſapplies them. What an infinite Scandal is this Man to the Church, who, (unlike a Chriſtian Prieſt, pronouncing the immutable and plain Truths of the Goſpel) reſembles the Heathen Juglers, making their Idols ſpeak their own Senſe, adapting their Oracles to all Occaſions, and explaining of 'em to all Purpoſes? How ſtedfaſt was the Wickedneſs? How Atheiſtical the Preſumption, to appeal to God for the Truth thereof, when he ought to have humbled himſelf before God for the *Flagrancy* of the Sin?

Let us conſider this Man, who ſays he is *ſatisfied of the Queen's being an Affectionate Nurſing Mother to the Church*, yet repreſents her, as an unnatural *Step-Mother*, who has committed *the Guardianſhip to ſuch lazy Defenders, and put her profeſſed Enemies into her Bowels.*

This is the Loyal and Faithful Subject, who would die for his Queen, and in Defence of her Title, who affirms to her Face, that the Means uſed to ſecure her Succeſſion to the Crown, were *odious and unjuſtifiable.*

Character of a Low-Church-Man, Page 29.

This is the Aſſerter of her Prerogatives, who ſaid, *That the Church Groan'd under the Prerogative Act, and Letter Miſſive*, i. e. Her Supremacy.

This Man doubtleſs muſt be in earneſt, when he commends Her Majeſty's Happy and Wiſe Adminiſtration, and the Vigilance of the Miniſtry, yet, after that he has made the Nation the very Sink of Perdition, he ſays, *That all theſe Miſchiefs walk up and down this Diſtracted Kingdom with Impunity.*

Speech, page 15.

Ded. to the Lord Mayor.

If ſome Perſons, through a real Senſe of Religion, ſhould apprehend any Danger of the Church, by reaſon of Vice and Immorality, inſeparable at all times, from all Nations under Heaven, always complain'd of, and never more than *now* diſcouraged: Yet the Queen has juſt reaſon *to think it very injurious to her, to take a Pretence from thence to inſinuate that the Church is in any Danger from her Adminiſtration*, and has as much reaſon to reſent the Indignity,

dignity, and ſuſpect the Deſign, as her Grandfather, the bleſſed Martyr had, upon the very ſame Occaſion. 'For, 'ſays he, when they did obſerve, that many *Honeſt* and 'Religious Minds in *that Houſe*, did complain of thoſe 'Dangers that did threaten the Church; they likewiſe 'took the ſame word in their 'Mouth, and their Cry was, *Templum Domini, Templum Domini, when the true Care of the Church never came into their Hearts*; and what the one did out 'of Zeal to Religion, the other took as a *plauſible Theam* 'to deprave our Government; *as if we, our Clergy, and* 'Council, *were either ſenſeleſs, or careleſs of Religion*; and 'this wicked Practice hath been, *to make us ſeem to walk* 'before our People, *as if we halted before God.* Ruſhworth, *Vol.* 1. Appendix, *f.* 6.

This Man muſt not be thought to intend to aſperſe the Memory of the late King, *whoſe Government*, he ſays, *was blown up by the Providence of God*, and who had *ruin'd the Church, had not an opportune Providence interpoſed*, *i. e.* His Death. Low-Church-Man, *p.* 4. and 16.

This Man prays as heartily, (as he ſwears) for the *Hannover* Succeſſion, but even there, he won't *acknowledge their Right* to the Succeſſion. *So high he is for the uninterrupted Succeſſion*; ſo firmly he adheres to the Hereditary, as the only Right; and ſtill ſuppoſes a Parliamentary Right to be the *Title of the Mob.*

He profeſſes not to *have the leaſt Diſlike of the Indulgence granted by Law to the Diſſenters*, and ſays, he has *declared his Approbation in the moſt expreſs Words imaginable*, viz. 'Queen Elizabeth, *like a Queen of true* "Reſolution, *and pious Zeal, pronounc'd, that ſuch were the* 'reſtleſs Spirits of that factious People, 'that no Quiet was to be expected from them, till they were utterly ſuppreſs'd; which, *like a prudent Princeſs, ſhe did by wholeſome Severities, that the Crown for many Years ſat eaſie, and flouriſhing upon her Head*; and had her Succeſſor, 'King James *but followed her wiſe Politicks*, &c. In his Sermon he commends the wholeſome Severities uſed towards 'em by Queen *Elizabeth*, wiſhes that her Succeſſors had followed her wiſe Politicks; and yet he'll Speech, *p.* 8. *St.* Paul's *Sermon.*

take

take it amiss, if we doubt his Sincerity, when in his Speech he desires to be believ'd, that he approve of the Indulgence now granted to them, who extols Queen *Elizabeth* for having *totally suppress'd* 'em.

This Man, who in his other Writings continually demands the *Execution of the Penal Laws, as in Queen* Elizabeth's *Time*; and in the mean time admonishes *our Superior Pastors to do their Duty in Thundering out their* Anathema's; to damn their Souls (which he still affirms they can, and ought to do) since their Goods and Persons are protected by the Law, will think it hard, to be thought, *to betray any want of Christian Moderation.*

I hope yet, that we all mean the same thing, tho' we express our selves differently about it, that we still wish the same thing; tho' we shew the contrary Passions of Joy and Sorrow upon the same occasion. I hope we are all going the same way, tho' some of us look backward. That, tho' we seem to have different Designs in working up the Plot, yet in the end they will all tend to bring about one Glorious Action; and that there is no other, but a *laudable Contention among us, who shall exceed the other in contributing to advance the Queen's present Happiness, and secure the Protestant Succession.* Yet I would desire one side to satisfy the other of their Sincerity, by desisting, to give out, that they are encourag'd by the Queen, (to do I don't know what,) by forbearing to libel the other side, under the Umbrage of (so unacceptably) addressing Her Majesty; and by those Addresses to insinuate that the Queen wants Encouragement from them; by ceasing *again* to traduce Her Majesty, as if she had a Secret Will, different from Her Declarations; and at last by granting Her Majesty, Her most ardent Wish, in uniting the Minds of her People.

There are some, no doubt, who wou'd repeal the *Toleration*, and dissolve the Union; who endeavour to defeat the *Hannover* Succession, and to unsettle the *Revolution.* They know well enough what Obedience is paid, even by this *abandon'd People*, to the Word of God, and what Influence the Clergy have, even when they pervert it. This very Method was taken formerly by the *Great* Earl of *Warwick*; he employ'd a very *Significant Tool*, that *Ecclesiastical Incendiary*, and predicant Herauld, Doctor *Goddard*, who proclaim'd at St. *Paul's too*, the *Divine Right*

Right of *Henry* the Sixth, set forth the Injuries done him, condemn'd the Resistance made against him, arraign'd the Parliamentary Title, and Recognition of the undoubted Right of the *House of York*; from hence the People concluded *Edward* the IV. to be an Usurper, immediately the *London* Mob took Arms, and deposed the Lawful Prince; and at that time 'twas the Priest, and not the *Earl*, who was the *King-maker*.

To prevent any such execrable Attempt, let some great Genius Project a *Monumental Act*; let the Preamble rehearse, how *London* and the whole Kingdom have *escap'd* a second *Fire*, by professed and *disguised Papists*: Let the Church, if possible, be settled in a more *Flourishing* and *Safe* Condition; let the Profession be still more encourag'd, and the Professors be made more worthy; let the Obedience of the Inferior Clergy, be bound to the Superior; let the *Supremacy* be secured to the Crown, and the *Dependency* to the *State*; and let some effectual Remedy be provident against *Applicationers* and *Occasional Abjurors*: Let the Crown be adorn'd with *all* its sparkling Prerogatives; let it cast such a Lustre as may make it look amiable, but not terrible: For the obtaining the Queen's *Wish, for the uniting the Minds of Her Subjects*; and for the fulfilling *Her Promise*, let the *Toleration* be *establish'd*.

Let the Act of Union, and the *Hanover* Succession be made Irreversible; let the *Revolution* be declared *honourable*; let the *necessary Means*, the Resistance then made, and in such deplorable Cases hereafter to be made, be allowed lawful and justifiable.

Let the Memory of our *Deliverers*, King *William* and Q. *Mary*, be inshrin'd in Glory: Then, let the Felicities of Queen *ANNE* be recorded, to amaze Posterity; and let Her Virtues be repeated, for their Example: Let Her Zeal for the Church, Her Benefactions to its Ministers, Her Wise Choice of its Guardians; Her Love for Her People, and their Duty to Her, be perpetuated. At last, let a most Ardent Prayer be framed, (equal if possible to our Wishes) for the longest Continuance of her precious Life, and for the invaluable Blessing of an Heir of her Body; and to ratify this Decree, it shall *Thunder and Lighten from on high*, and the Voice of God, as it were, shall be heard in the Universal Joy, and Acclamations of the People, *Amen*, and *Amen*.

APPENDIX.

STATE TRACTS, Vol. 1. p. 539, 540.

The great Charter of King John.

'AND whereas we have granted all 'these things for God's sake, and for 'the Amendment of our Government, 'and for the better comprising the Discord arisen betwixt Us and our Barons: 'We, willing that the same be firmly held and establish'd 'for ever, do make and grant to our Barons the Security 'underwritten; to wit, That the Barons shall chuse 'Five and Twenty Barons of the Realm, whom they list, 'who shall to their utmost Power keep and hold, and 'cause to be kept the Peace and Liberties which we 'have granted and confirmed by this our present Charter; 'insomuch, that if We, or our Justice, or our Bayliff, 'or any of our Ministers, act contrary to the same in any 'thing, against any Persons, or offend against any Article of this Peace and Security, and such our Miscarriage 'be shown to four Barons of the said Five and Twenty, 'those four Barons shall come to Us, or to our Justice, 'if we be out of the Realm, and shew Us our Miscarriages, and require Us to amend the same without delay; 'and if we do not amend it, or if we be out of the Realm, 'our Justice do not amend it within forty Days after the 'same is shown to Us, or to our Justice if we out of the 'Realm, *Then the said four Barons shall report the same to 'the Residue of the said Five and Twenty Barons, and then 'those Five and Twenty Barons, with the Commonalty of all* 'England, *may distress Us by all the ways they can; to wit, 'by seizing on our Castles, Lands and Possessions, and by 'what other means they can, till it be amended, as they 'shall adjudge; saving our own Person, the Person of our 'Queen, and the Persons of our Children*; and when it is 'amended, they shall be subject to Us as before; and 'whoever of the Realms will, may swear, that for the 'Performance of these things he will obey the Commands of the said five and twenty Barons, and that together with them he will distress Us to his Power: And

'we

' we give publick and free leave to swear to all that will
' swear, and will never hinder any one: And for all Per-
' sons of the Realm, that of their own accord will swear
' to the said Five and Twenty Barons to distress Us, We
' will issue our Precept, commanding them to swear as a-
' foresaid.

REFLECTIONS on a late Pamphlet, entitled, Priest-craft in Perfection.

——Antiquam exquirite Matrem.

THE Author of a late Pamphlet, entitled, *Priestcraft in Perfection*, has taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that the Clause of the *Churches Power* was not contained in the *imprinted Book of Articles* that was established by Law; which in my Opinion was not absolutely necessary to his Purpose: For upon a strict Survey of the Words of the Act of Parliament, and calling to mind some Passages I had met with in Books, I find that none of the Articles contained in that *imprinted Book* were confirmed by Law, except those Articles which *only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*; and that the Articles contained in the said *imprinted Book* which relate to *Discipline*, and to such Doctrines as concern not the Essence of the *Christian Faith*, and *the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, were not passed by the Parliament. And therefore that Author might have inferred, that the Clause of the *Churches Power* could not be confirmed by Law, tho' it was contained in the *imprinted Book* ratify'd by Parliament, because that *Clause* relates only to *Discipline*. I wonder that a Gentleman so willing to destroy the Credit of *Church-Authority*, should over look this Consideration, when it tended not only to serve his Purpose of proving, That the Clause of the *Churches Power* was not Establish'd by Law, but to take off from the Legal Au-

thority of so many other Articles of the Church, which are now universally thought to be Established by Law. But few Mens Acuteness is equal to their Zeal; and therefore our Author has, throughout his Book, suppos'd, *That all the Articles, contained in the imprinted Book, referred to by the Act of Parliament, are establish'd by Law.* But to carry on the Matter further than he has done, I shall produce the very words of the Law, and then confirm the Sense I shall give of it by some undeniable Authorities. The Articles confirmed by Law are, *All the Arti-*

13 Eliz. *c.* 12. *cles of Religion, which ONLY concern the Confession of the True Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a Book imprinted, intitul'd,* ' Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Arch-' bishops, and Bishops, and the whole Clergy, in the ' Convocation holden at *London*, in the Year of our Lord ' God, 1562, *&c.* Which Words plainly confirm only those *Articles comprised in the imprinted Book*, which can be reduced to these two Heads, *viz. Articles that concern only the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*; and exclude all other Articles which fall not under those two Heads.

This seems to me to be the obvious Sense of the Words of the Law; and if the Reader will but consider, when he reflects on the words, That in Q. *Elizabeth*'s time Matters of Discipline and Ceremony were esteemed of high Consequence, and disputed of with great Vehemence among the Protestants of *England*; and I may add, with a Zeal equal to that which we see at this day in relation to *Passive-Obedience*; it is impossible to imagine, that the Parliament would not have mention'd *Articles* of Discipline, (which ran so much in their Heads) as well as Articles that *concerned only the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*; unless they had excluded all the Articles that related to *Discipline*. And the same may be said in regard to other Doctrines contained in the *Thirty Nine Articles*, which fell not under the two Heads mentioned in the Act of Parliament.

I do not expect that the Sense I have given of the Law (how just soever it is) should of it self convince Men who are already strongly engaged in the common Opinion. But when they come to consider what I have further to say, and join what I have already said with it, I am not with-

without Hopes of convincing all unprejudiced Men, that I have given the true Sense of the Law.

1. In the first place, I shall produce the Authority of that great Lawyer Mr. *Selden*.

The Table *under the Head* Articles.

He tells us, 'There is a Secret concerning the Articles: Of late Ministers 'have subscribed to all of them, but by 'Act of Parliament that confirmed them, 'they ought only to subscribe to those Articles which contain Matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, as appears by the first Subscriptions. But Bishop *Bancroft* (in the Convocation held in King *James*'s Days) he began it, that Ministers should subscribe to three things, to the King's Supremacy, to the Common-Prayer, and to the Thirty Nine Articles; many of them do not contain matter of Faith. Is it matter of Faith how the Church should be governed? Whether Infants should be baptized? Whether we have any Property in our Goods, *&c.*

These words not only declare Mr. *Seldon*'s Opinion of the meaning of the Law, but make him testify a matter of Fact that confirms his Opinion, and puts the Truth of his Opinion beyond all doubt: For if the *first Subscriptions* were only to such parts of the Thirty nine Articles as *contain only matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, it must be because the Law was at first understood to relate only to such of the Thirty Nine Articles as come under one of those Heads.

Whether the Fact be true or no that Mr. *Selden* relates, may I suppose at this day be put out of all question; for I doubt not but there are Places where the first Subscriptions of the Clergy to the Articles are kept. I am not skilful enough in Ecclesiastical Matters to say *where*; but wherever they are, I do, upon the Opinion I have of Mr. *Selden*'s great Integrity, appeal to those Subscriptions for the Truth of what Mr. *Selden* affirms.

2. But besides the Authority of Mr. *Selden* as a Lawyer, and a Witness of a Matter of Fact, whereby it appears that the Parliament did confirm only some of the Thirty Nine Articles, I will present the Reader with a Passage that I find among the *Journals of Parliament*, published by Sir *Simon D'Ewes*, in a Speech of *Peter Wentworth*, Esq; one of the Burgesses for the Borough of *Tregony* in *Cornwal*, made

made in the Parliament of 1575. wherein, among abundance of other things worthy of Remark, 'tis affirm'd by him, *p.* 239. 'That he had heard of old Parliament-Men, 'that the Baniſhment of the Pope and Popery, and the re-'ſtoring of true Religion, had their beginning from this 'Houſe, and not from the Biſhops; and he had heard 'that few Laws for Religion had their Foundation from 'them. —I was, *ſays he*, amongſt others the laſt Par-'liament ſent to the Biſhop of *Canterbury* for the Arti-'cles of Religion that then paſs'd this Houſe. He ask'd 'us, why we did put out of the Book the Articles for 'the Homilies, Conſecrating of Biſhops, and ſuch like? 'Surely Sir, ſaid I, becauſe we were ſo occupy'd in other 'Matters, that we had no time to examine them, how 'they agreed with the Word of God. What, ſaid he, 'ſurely you miſtook the Matter; you will refer your 'ſelves wholly to us therein? No, by the Faith I bear to 'God, ſaid I, we will paſs nothing before we underſtand 'what it is; for that were but to make you Popes: 'Make you Popes who liſt, ſaid I, for we will make you 'none. And ſure, Mr. Speaker, the Speech ſeem'd to 'me to be a Pope-like Speech; and I fear leſt our Bi-'ſhops do attribute this of the Pope's Canons to them-'ſelves (*Papa non poteſt errare*:) for ſurely if they did 'not, they would reform things amiſs, and not ſpurn a-'gainſt God's People for writing as they do.

1. Theſe words of Mr. *Wentworth* are a plain Evidence of the Matter of Fact, *That the Parliament put out, or did not confirm, ſeveral of the* 39 *Articles*. For this Speech was deliver'd in Parliament in 1575. about five Years after the Parliament eſtabliſhed the Articles; and therefore it is not to be imagined that Mr. *Wentworth* ſhould have affirmed, that any *Articles were put out by the Houſe*, unleſs they really were put out; when there muſt of courſe have been ſo many Members of Parliament preſent, who were Members in 1571. (when the Articles were eſtabliſh'd) able to contradict him, had not what he ſaid been true.

Beſides, Mr. *Wentworth* was ſtop'd in the Progreſs of this Speech for his great Boldneſs, and afterwards examin'd before a Committee of the Houſe (to whom he gave it in Writing) on the account of ſome Exceptions taken to ſome Paſſages which he had delivered; but no

no-

notice was taken of this Particular, as appears from his *Examination*, printed immediately after his Speech, in the *Journal* of Sir *Simon D' Ewes*; and consequently it is reasonable to imagine, that the *Committee* was conscious that what he delivered in that Particular, was true.

2. The Words of Mr. *Wentworth* are not only an Evidence of the Matter of Fact, that the House of Commons *put out*, or did not confirm several Articles contained in the *Imprinted Book of Articles*; but do so fall in with the Expressions of the *Act of Parliament*, as to leave no reasonable Doubt but that the Parliament passed not several Articles contain'd in the *Imprinted Book*.

For the Articles put out, according to Mr. *Wentworth*, were, the *Article for the Homilies*, *the Article for Consecrating Bishops*, *and such like*; which is as much as to say, Articles relating to such Doctrines as were not Fundamentals, or of the Essence of Christian Faith, and Articles relating to Discipline. To which Heads, if you add these two mention'd in the Act of Parliament, *viz. Articles that only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith*, *and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, you have all the Heads under which Matters of Divinity are usually rank'd. So that the Words of the Act of Parliament, and of Mr. *Wentworth*, are like Tallies to one another. Wherefore I think I may conclude, *That several of the Thirty Nine Articles were not confirm'd by the Parliament*. For since the Words of the Law have so plain a relation to the Distinction of Articles into different Kinds, and since a Distinction of Articles into different Kinds is confirm'd by Matter of Fact, and since that Distinction is a common Distinction in Divinity, I think the Words of the *Act of Parliament* ought to be understood conformably to it. For why should any one suppose the Parliament expressed themselves unaccurately, and that they meant all the *Articles comprized* in the *Imprinted Book*, when they speak of those *only which concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith*, *and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, comprised in that *Imprinted Book:* while taking the Words in the obvious Sense, and in the Sense agreeable to Matter of Fact, and the Nature of things, makes 'em use the most accurate Expression in the World?

How many of our Thirty Nine Articles are struck out from being established by Law by the foregoing Comment

ment on the Law, cannot be known with that Certainty as if we had the *Imprinted Book of Articles* recorded, as our other Laws are. Then perhaps we should have seen what Articles were confirm'd, and what were not confirm'd. But since we are deprived of that Light about Religious Matters establish'd by Law, that we have in Civil Matters establish'd by Law, we have no other way to find the *Articles* establish'd by Law, but by running over the whole 39 Articles, and considering the Nature of them. This I do not propose at present to take upon me; but only beg leave to observe, That we may be sure we have no Homilies by Law establish'd. For the *Homilies* are no otherwise supposed to be establish'd by Law, than as they are a part of the Thirty Nine Articles; the 35th whereof affirms them *to contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times.* And Mr. *Wentworth* directly says, *The Article for the Homilies was put out by the House.* Tho' had he not mention'd that *Article*, the Matter would have otherwise been very plain. For how can an Article, which affirms, *That* 33 Sermons or *Homilies do contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times*, be one of the Articles of Religion *which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments?* The Articles which only concern the Confession of the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments are no more concern'd whether there should be any Homilies, or whether these Sermons or Homilies *contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times*, than they are concern'd in the numerous Sermons and Books, cited by *Sacheverell*'s Council in behalf of Passive Obedience.

What I have said, is, I hope, sufficient to carry the Point further than the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection* has done, who has argued on the Supposition, that *all the Thirty Nine Articles are establish'd by Law*; and to convince any Man that is more concern'd for Truth than his own Opinion, not only that the Clause of the *Church's Power*, in the beginning of the 20th Article, is not confirm'd by Law, but that *there are several of the Thirty Nine Articles not confirm'd by Law.*

FINIS.